



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,122	08/29/2000	Mitsusuke Kyogoku	ASMJP.062AUS	9091

20945 7590 08/08/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

KACKAR, RAM N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/650,122

Applicant(s)

KYOGOKU ET AL.

Examiner

Ram N Kackar

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams (US Patent 6959507) in view of Predhome Jr (US Patent Re 30188) and further in view of Hautau (US Patent 4134305).

Adams discloses a multi-chamber load locking device divided in to an upper chamber (Fig2-34) a lower chamber (Fig2-38) and an intermediate section located between the upper chamber and the lower chamber (Fig2-36), a divider plate (Fig2-73) having an upper side and a lower side both of which are adapted to support wafers (Fig2-66 and 68), the plate (Fig2-73) moving reciprocally between an upper position and a lower position so that when the plate is at upper position it divides and seals the upper chamber from intermediate section and lower chamber (Fig2-38) and when the plate is at lower position the plate divides and seals the lower chamber from intermediate section and upper chamber (Fig2-34), seals (Fig2-58 and 60) and doors (Col 4 line 16) which can go on openings (Fig 2-40 and 44), which makes it adaptable to be disposed between a loading station and a transfer chamber (Fig 2, Fig 1-26, 28). It would have been obvious to eliminate the two redundant plates in Adams to reduce cost.

Art Unit: 1763

Adam does not disclose the plate lift mechanism of cylindrical cam structure and a rotary actuator. Adam also does not disclose a beam having sliding support fixed to the support cylinder.

Predhome Jr discloses cam follower as part of a cylindrical body coaxial with the cam structure (Fig 5 -82) and discloses the cylinder with the cam grooves outside the cam follower undergoing reciprocal motion, the cam cylinder having a cam groove having a shape which can be divided in five sections (i) upper horizontal (ii) lower horizontal (iii) intermediate section (iv) upper transition section and (v) lower transition section to make sure that while the plate is going towards sealing to any position it moves slowly and the transition from higher speed of intermediate section to low speed of sealing is smooth (Fig 5-54).

Hautau (US Patent 4134305) discloses a cylindrical cam structure (Fig 4-114) whose rotation causes a vertical movement of cam follower (Fig 4-124) where the cam follower slides on a beam (Fig 4- 122) to act as a guide for up/down movement.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to install a cam groove and cam follower taught by Predhome Jr to Adam's load lock to provide for the reciprocal motion of the divider plate as the mechanism is lot simpler, cheaper and reliable to use and provides break at upper and lower stops.

Also, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a beam for guidance to the lifting mechanism adapted for Adam's load lock device.

Seals on Adams are disclosed to be O Ring seals (Fig2-58 and 60 disclose seals in a way O Ring seals are disclosed typically in a drawing). Phillips et al (US Patent 4889319) discloses several seals in the same way (Fig 1 and 5-7).

Application/Control Number: 09/650,122

Art Unit: 1763

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams (US Patent 6959507) in view of Predhome Jr (US Patent Re 30188) and Hautau (US Patent 4134305) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Takashi Sada (US 5885690).

Predhome Jr or Hautau do not disclose the cam structure made of indent treated carbon steel.

Because of its property of strength and hardness, Carbon steel is used frequently for making machine parts like cam follower. Takashi Sada discloses such a use (Col 2 lines 54-60 and Col 3 lines 26-30).

Therefore making cam structure of carbon steel would have been obvious for its properties of strength and hardness.

Response to Amendment

Applicants arguments filed on 7/8/2003 have been considered but not found to be persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Predhome Jr and Hautau is unreasonable.

Examiner disagrees.

The rejection as above relies on the combination of Adams to both Predhome Jr and Hautau. Predhome Jr. provides a teaching of a lift mechanism and Hautau provides a teaching of guidance for the lift mechanism to Adams.

Applicant further argues that in Predhome Jr. there is no concern of sealing at upper and lower ends and high load lifting. Examiner disagrees

Art Unit: 1763

Contrary to what the applicant suggests, the lift mechanism of Predhome Jr. is designed for high load lifting, as when the valve works against high compression in the cylinder

Applicant further argues that in Predhome Jr. there is no suggestion of coaxial structure of the cam and the actuator. Examiner disagrees.

Fig 5 and 6 clearly show the coaxial structure of the cam and the actuator.

Applicant further argues that use of O-Rings with a cam structure for load lock is new.

It may be new but not non-obvious. The rejection relies on obviousness and not on novelty.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 703 305 3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 703 308 1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9310 for regular communications and 703 872 9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0661.


Application/Control Number: 09/650,122

Page 6

Art Unit: 1763

RK

August 1, 2003


[Faint, illegible text]